

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No. 09/884,095

Conf. No. 2413

In Re Application of: Blocher et al.

Art Unit: 3629

Filed: 06/19/2001

Dkt. #: END920010013US1 (IBME-0017)

Cust. No.: 23550

Examiner: Brooks, Matthew L.

Title: **BUSINESS PROCESS CONTROL POINT TEMPLATE AND METHOD**

Mail Stop BPAI
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Real Party in Interest

International Business Machines Corporation is the real party in interest.

Related Appeals and Interferences

Applicants state that they are not currently aware of any prior or pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings which may directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Claim Status

As filed, this case included claims 1-30. Claims 1-2 and 4-30 are currently pending and have been rejected as set forth in the Office Action dated June 1, 2007, while claim 3 was canceled earlier in the prosecution of the application. The claims on appeal are claims 1-2 and 4-30.

Status of Amendments

There have not been any amendments filed subsequent to the last issued Office Action.

Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The claimed invention relates generally to methods for reviewing a business process to identify and address risks (i.e., control points). In addition, the present invention provides a template and method for arranging information pertaining to each control point. Below is a concise explanation of the subjected matter defined in independent claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 16, 19, 23, 26 and 28 which are each involved in this appeal. In addition, the summary points out elements in the figures that correspond to claim features as well as sections in the specification that discuss the features.

Claim 1 claims a computer implemented method for reviewing a business process to identify and address risks, comprising the steps of: providing a business process (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 17-20, p. 14, ln. 6-15, Fig. 8, item 202); identifying risks in the business process as control points (*see e.g.*, p. 11, ln. 14-17, p. 14, ln. 16-20, Fig. 8, item 204); and arranging information pertaining to the control points in a standard format using a separate template for each control point and storing the template in a computer database to provide subsequent access to the

template, (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 16-21, p. 11, ln. 10-20, p. 15, ln. 11-14, Fig. 8, item 206), wherein the information comprises a set of tests to be performed by a test entity, and wherein the set of tests identify an occurrence of the risks in the business process (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-19, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, p. 19, ln. 16-21, Fig. 9, item 302).

Claim 7 claims a computer implemented method for reviewing a business process to identify and address risks, comprising the steps of: providing a business process (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 17-20, p. 14, ln. 6-15, Fig. 8, item 202); implementing a set of tests to be performed by a test entity to identify an occurrence of the risks in the business process as control points (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-19, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, p. 19, ln. 16-21, Fig. 9, item 302); identifying a set of actions to address the identified occurrence of the risks (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 19-20, p. 15, ln. 6-9, p. 20, ln. 6-15, Fig. 9, item 304); and arranging the set of tests and the identified actions in a standard format using a separate template for each control point, and storing the template in a computer database to provide subsequent access to the template (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 16-21, p. 11, ln. 10-13, p. 11, ln. 20-p. 12, ln. 7, p. 15, ln. 10-19, p. 16, ln. 8-20, Figs. 2-7, items 50, 80, 100, 130, 150 and 168).

Claim 10 claims a computer implemented method for reviewing a business process to identify and address risks, comprising the steps of: providing a business process (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 17-20, p. 14, ln. 6-15, Fig. 8, item 202); implementing a set of tests to be performed by a test entity to identify an occurrence of the risks in the business process as control points (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-19, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, p. 19, ln. 16-21, Fig. 9, item 302); identifying a set of actions to address the identified occurrence of the risks (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 19-20, p. 15, ln. 6-9, p. 20, ln. 6-15, Fig. 9, item 304); arranging the business process , the set of tests, and the identified actions in a standard format using a separate template for each control point, and

storing the template in a computer database to provide subsequent access to the template (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 16-21, p. 11, ln. 10-13, p. 11, ln. 20-p. 12, ln. 7, p. 15, ln. 10-19, p. 16, ln. 8-20, Figs. 2-7, items 50, 80, 100, 130, 150 and 168); and auditing the control points based on the template (*see e.g.*, p. 9, ln. 1-2, p. 16, ln. 13-16, p. 21, ln. 19 – p. 22, ln. 2, Fig. 7, item 184).

Claim 12 claims a computer implemented method for arranging business process control point information in a template, comprising the steps of: arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity in a test field (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-19, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, p. 19, ln. 11-21, Fig. 5, item 140), wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in the business process (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-20, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, Fig. 9, item 302); arranging a set of actions in an action field, wherein the set of actions addresses the identified occurrence of a risk (*see e.g.*, p. 15, ln. 6-9, p. 20, ln. 6-15, Fig. 9, item 304); and wherein the template corresponds to a single control point (*see e.g.*, p. 15, ln. 12-13, p. 16, ln. 9-11).

Claim 16 claims a computer implemented method for arranging business process control point information in a template, comprising the steps of: arranging a business process in a business process field (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 17-20, p. 11, ln. 10-14, p. 14, ln. 2-15, Fig. 8, item 202); arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity in a test field (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-19, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, p. 19, ln. 11-21, Fig. 5, item 140), wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in the business process (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-20, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, Fig. 9, item 302); arranging a set of actions in an action field, wherein the set of actions addresses the identified occurrence of a risk (*see e.g.*, p. 15, ln. 6-9, p. 20, ln. 6-15, Fig. 9, item 304); and wherein the template corresponds to a single control point (*see e.g.*, p. 15, ln. 12-13, p. 16, ln. 9-11).

Claim 19 claims a computer implemented template for arranging business process control

point information, comprising: a test field for arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-19, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, p. 19, ln. 11-21, Fig. 5, item 140), wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in a business process (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-20, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, Fig. 9, item 302); an action field for arranging a set of actions, wherein the set of actions addresses the identified occurrence of a risk (*see e.g.*, p. 15, ln. 6-9, p. 20, ln. 6-15, Fig. 9, item 304); and wherein the template corresponds to a single control point (*see e.g.*, p. 15, ln. 12-13, p. 16, ln. 9-11).

Claim 23 claims a computer implemented template for arranging business process control point information, comprising: a business process field for arranging a business process (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 17-20, p. 11, ln. 10-14, p. 14, ln. 2-15, Fig. 8, item 202); a test field for arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-19, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, p. 19, ln. 11-21, Fig. 5, item 140), wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in the business process (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-20, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, Fig. 9, item 302); an action field for arranging a set of actions, wherein the set of actions addresses the identified occurrence of a risk (*see e.g.*, p. 15, ln. 6-9, p. 20, ln. 6-15, Fig. 9, item 304); and wherein the template corresponds to a single control point (*see e.g.*, p. 15, ln. 12-13, p. 16, ln. 9-11).

Claim 26 claims a computer implemented template for arranging business process control point information, comprising: a business process field for arranging a business process (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 17-20, p. 11, ln. 10-14, p. 14, ln. 2-15, Fig. 8, item 202); a test field for arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-19, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, p. 19, ln. 11-21, Fig. 5, item 140), wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in the business process steps (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-20, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, Fig. 9, item 302); an action field for arranging a set of actions, wherein the set of actions addresses the identified risks

(*see e.g.*, p. 20, ln. 6-15, Fig. 6, item 154, Fig. 9, item 304); a test execution field for arranging a test entity, wherein the test entity performs the set of tests (*see e.g.*, p. 19, ln. 17-19, Fig. 5, item 142, Fig. 9, item 302); an action execution field for arranging an action entity, wherein the action entity performs the set of actions (*see e.g.*, p. 20, ln. 11-12, Fig. 6, item 156); an audit field for arranging audit details (*see e.g.*, p. 21, ln. 19-20, Fig. 7, item 184); and wherein the template corresponds to a single control point (*see e.g.*, p. 15, ln. 12-13, p. 16, ln. 9-11).

Claim 28 claims a program product stored on a recordable medium for arranging business process control point information in a template, comprising: an interface for receiving business process control point information (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 14-16, p. 11, ln. 13-15, Fig. 1, item 24); a separate template for each control point for arranging the received information (*see e.g.*, p. 11, ln. 10-18, p. 15, ln. 12-13, p. 16, ln. 9-11), wherein the template comprises: a test field for arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-19, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, p. 19, ln. 11-21, Fig. 5, item 140), wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in a business process (*see e.g.*, p. 10, ln. 18-20, p. 14, ln. 21-p. 15, ln. 6, Fig. 9, item 302); and an action field for arranging a set of actions, wherein the set of actions addresses the occurrence of the identified risk (*see e.g.*, p. 20, ln. 6-15, Fig. 6, item 154, Fig. 9, item 304).

Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Whether claims 1-2 and 4-30 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the public activities of Keane Inc. as of May 5th, 2000 as shown by their web Homepage as of said date and “PRAM it or walk away”; Gray, Neal; Transactions of AACE International; pp. r5-48; 1988, collectively one reference (“PRAM”).

ARGUMENT

Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 4-30 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Over PRAM Reference

Appellants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over PRAM is defective. The Examiner has the burden to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Section 103 of Title 35 of the United States Code provides the test for obviousness under which the pending claims have been rejected:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case for obviousness when rejecting an application under Section 103. *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 580, 583 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case, the rejection is improper and will be overturned. *See In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success.

Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Appellants respectfully submit that the PRAM reference fails to meet each of the three basic criteria required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. As such, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is defective.

In support of its rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Office asserts that the PRAM reference discloses all of the elements of claims 1 and 7-10 *except* the claim limitation that there is a separate template for each control point. The Office attempts to cure this deficiency with a general statement that “when the prior art teaches all of the limitations except for making separable the steps of components the application’s claims are held to be obvious.” Office Action, p. 5. In support of this statement, the Office cites to *In re. Dulberg*, 289 F.2d 522, 523, 129 USPQ 348, 349 (CCPA 1961). While Applicants do not argue with this general statement of law, *In re. Dulberg* is distinguishable from the present case and does not provide the proper support for the Office’s rejection. *In re. Dulberg* involved an application for a lipstick holder with a removable cap. In that case, it was held that the patent was invalid over the prior art wherein the prior art taught a lipstick holder with a cap that was press fit and therefore not manually removable. Therefore, in that case, all of the claim elements were found in the prior art, except that one element (the cap) was not manually removable.

In contrast, in the present case, it is not merely a question of separating out two elements that are already in the prior art. As admitted by the Office, the sole 103(a) reference cited by the Office, the PRAM reference, does not disclose the claim limitation of providing a separate template for each control point. The Office’s attempt to add an element to the prior art without proper support is improper. This claim limitation is simply not present in the PRAM reference, and it is not enough for the Office to simply state that it would be obvious to add it in. PRAM

does not “teach all of the limitations except for making separable the steps of components” as required by the *In re. Dulberg* case. As such, the Office’s reliance on this precedent is improper. Instead, the Office must point to each and every element from the claimed invention in the prior art. The Office has not, nor could it, meet this burden with respect to the PRAM reference.

Specifically, Applicants submit that the PRAM reference, either singly or in combination with the Office’s Official Notice, fails to disclose, *inter alia*, the step of “arranging information pertaining to the control points in a standard format using a separate template for each control point and storing the template in a computer database to provide subsequent access to the template . . .” (*See* claim 1, and as similarly recited by claims 7, 10, 12, 16, 19, 23, 26, and 28.)

Applicants submit that the PRAM reference discloses a risk profile (Fig. 3) with all the key risks on one page. PRAM reference, page C, section V. As shown in Figure 3 of the PRAM reference, each risk variable (Stable Specs, SME’s Available as Scheduled, etc.) is listed in the same profile/template. In contrast, the present invention claims, *inter alia*, a method for reviewing a business process that includes a separate template for each control point for arranging business process review information.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that the PRAM reference does not disclose several other features of the claimed invention, in addition to the “separate template” element discussed above. For example, Applicants submit that the PRAM reference does not disclose a template to identify whether the risk has actually occurred. The PRAM reference discloses:

“[o]nce the initial estimates exist, the estimator must make a list of all risks for the task, project, job, or proposal that is being addressed. Listen for words and phrases including, ‘That’s an issue,’ ‘I don’t know,’ ‘We assume,’ ‘I’m not sure,’ ‘I think,’ ‘I have no idea,’ or ‘We’ll figure it out as we go.’ These are a few tell-tale phrases that indicate the potential for risk.”

(See PRAM reference, section V.) According to the above passage, the PRAM reference discloses a method of risk identification based on verbal communication(s) between the customer and the estimator. *Id.* Depending on the words/phrases used by the customer, the risks are identified and listed in the template. See Fig. 3 of the PRAM reference. However, the template in Fig. 3 does not contain, list, or arrange any of the methods/tests used by the estimator and the client to identify a specific occurrence of a risk. For example, Fig. 3 of the PRAM reference makes no disclosure of a column or metric for displaying the various verbal communication clues used by the estimator to identify risks. As such, various estimators may reach inconsistent results by using different methods of identification. These problems are magnified for a new estimator or an external estimator unfamiliar with the verbal communication method of risk identification taught by the PRAM reference.

In contrast, as discussed above, the present invention discloses, *inter alia*, a method for reviewing a business process that includes a standard template for arranging business process review information, wherein the information includes a set of tests to be performed by a test entity in a test field. This allows all review information for a particular control point to be arranged in a separate template and stored so that reviewers, auditors or the like can refer to the template to accurately and efficiently perform their duties. The PRAM reference fails to disclose this claimed feature. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the PRAM reference discloses generally a template for identifying risks, Applicants submit that the PRAM reference does not disclose a template to identify whether the risk has actually occurred. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the PRAM reference fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that the PRAM reference, which fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, may not be bolstered simply by a recitation of the

general business services provided by Keane Inc. The nature of Keane Inc.'s business may not be used to supplement an element absent from the PRAM reference. Unless each and every element of Applicants claim 1 is taught by the PRAM reference, the rejection is improper. As discussed above, nowhere does the PRAM reference disclose, *inter alia*, arranging information pertaining to the control points in a standard format using a separate template for each control point and storing the templates in a computer database to provide subsequent access to the template, wherein the information comprises the set of tests to identify an occurrence of the risks in the business process. Therefore, the Office's rejections based on the PRAM reference are improper and without factual support.

With respect to independent claims 7, 10, 12, 16, 19, 23, 26, and 28, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments made above with respect to claim 1. With respect to dependent claims 2, 4-6, 8-9, 11, 13-15, 17-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27, and 29-30, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

Conclusion

In summary, Appellants submit that claims 1-2 and 4-30 are allowable because the Examiner has not shown that all the claim limitations are taught or suggested by the prior art. In particular, the Examiner has failed to support the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness over the PRAM reference. Therefore, Appellant submits that the obviousness rejections are untenable and requests that the Board reverse the rejections set forth in the Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Meghan Q. Toner/

Meghan Q. Toner

Reg. No.: 52,142

Date: October 31, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

CLAIMS APPENDIX

The following is a listing of the current claims involved in the appeal:

1. A computer implemented method for reviewing a business process to identify and address risks, comprising the steps of:

providing a business process;
identifying risks in the business process as control points; and
arranging information pertaining to the control points in a standard format using a separate template for each control point and storing the template in a computer database to provide subsequent access to the template, wherein the information comprises a set of tests to be performed by a test entity, and wherein the set of tests identify an occurrence of the risks in the business process.

2. The method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

identifying actions to address the risks;
arranging the identified actions in the template; and
performing an audit using the template.

4. The method of claim 1, wherein the step of arranging information further comprises a set of actions, wherein the set of actions address the occurrence of the risks.

5. The method of claim 4, wherein the step of arranging information further comprises:

a business process;

an action entity, wherein the action entity performs the set of actions; and

audit details.

6. The method of claim 5, wherein the step of arranging information further comprises:

a control point name;

control point revisions;

background information; and

a control point frequency.

7. A computer implemented method for reviewing a business process to identify and address risks, comprising the steps of:

providing a business process;

implementing a set of tests to be performed by a test entity to identify an occurrence of the risks in the business process as control points;

identifying a set of actions to address the identified occurrence of the risks; and

arranging the set of tests and the identified actions in a standard format using a separate template for each control point, and storing the template in a computer database to provide subsequent access to the template.

8. The method of claim 7, wherein the step of implementing the set of tests and the set of actions comprise control point information.

9. The method of claim 7, further comprising the step of accessing the stored template to perform an audit.

10. A computer implemented method for reviewing a business process to identify and address risks, comprising the steps of:

providing a business process;

implementing a set of tests to be performed by a test entity to identify an occurrence of the risks in the business process as control points;

identifying a set of actions to address the identified occurrence of the risks;

arranging the business process, the set of tests, and the identified actions in a standard format using a separate template for each control point, and storing the template in a computer database to provide subsequent access to the template; and

auditing the control points based on the template.

11. The method of claim 10, wherein the implementing step comprises the step of examining steps in the business process to identify risks.

12. A computer implemented method for arranging business process control point information in a template, comprising the steps of:

arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity in a test field, wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in the business process;

arranging a set of actions in an action field, wherein the set of actions addresses the identified occurrence of a risk; and

wherein the template corresponds to a single control point.

13. The method of claim 12, further comprising the steps of:

arranging a business process in a business process field;

arranging a test entity in a test execution field, wherein the test entity performs the set of tests;

arranging an action entity in an action execution field, wherein the action entity performs the set of actions; and

arranging audit details in an audit field.

14. The method of claim 13, further comprising:

arranging a control point name in a name field;

arranging control point revisions in a revision field;

arranging background information in an information field; and

arranging a control point frequency in an interval field.

15. The method of claim 12, further comprising the step of performing an audit based on the stored template.

16. A computer implemented method for arranging business process control point information in a template, comprising the steps of:

arranging a business process in a business process field;

arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity in a test field, wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in the business process;

arranging a set of actions in an action field, wherein the set of actions addresses the identified occurrence of a risk; and

wherein the template corresponds to a single control point.

17. The method of claim 16, further comprising the steps of:

arranging a test entity in a test execution field, wherein the test entity performs the set of tests;

arranging an action entity in an action execution field, wherein the action entity performs the set of actions; and

arranging audit details in an audit field;

storing the template in a computer database to provide subsequent access to the template;

and

performing an audit based on the stored template.

18. The method of claim 17, further comprising:

arranging a control point name in a name field;

arranging control point revisions in a revision field;

arranging background information in an information field; and

arranging a control point frequency in an interval field.

19. A computer implemented template for arranging business process control point information,

comprising:

a test field for arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity, wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in a business process;

an action field for arranging a set of actions, wherein the set of actions addresses the identified occurrence of a risk; and

wherein the template corresponds to a single control point.

20. The computer implemented template of claim 19, further comprising:

a business process field for arranging a business process;

a test execution field for arranging a test entity, wherein the test entity performs the set of tests;

an action execution field for arranging an action entity, wherein the action entity performs the set of actions; and

an audit field for arranging audit details.

21. The computer implemented template of claim 20, further comprising:

a name field for arranging a control point name;

a revision field for arranging control point revisions;

an information field for arranging background information; and

an interval field for arranging a control point frequency.

22. The computer implemented template of claim 19, wherein the risks comprise control points, and wherein the set of tests and the set of actions comprise control point information.

23. A computer implemented template for arranging business process control point information, comprising:

- a business process field for arranging a business process;

- a test field for arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity, wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in the business process;

- an action field for arranging a set of actions, wherein the set of actions addresses the identified occurrence of a risk; and

- wherein the template corresponds to a single control point.

24. The computer implemented template of claim 23, further comprising:

- a test execution field for arranging a test entity, wherein the test entity performs the set of tests;

- an action execution field for arranging an action entity, wherein the action entity performs the set of actions; and

- an audit field for arranging audit details.

25. The computer implemented template of claim 24, further comprising:

- a name field for arranging a control point name;

- a revision field for arranging control point revisions;

- an information field for arranging background information; and

- an interval field for arranging a control point frequency.

26. A computer implemented template for arranging business process control point information, comprising:

a business process field for arranging a business process;

a test field for arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity, wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in the business process steps;

an action field for arranging a set of actions, wherein the set of actions addresses the identified risks;

a test execution field for arranging a test entity, wherein the test entity performs the set of tests;

an action execution field for arranging an action entity, wherein the action entity performs the set of actions;

an audit field for arranging audit details; and

wherein the template corresponds to a single control point.

27. The computer implemented template of claim 26, further comprising:

a name field for arranging a control point name;

a revision history field for arranging control point revisions, wherein the revision history field includes fields for arranging a revision number, a revision date, a summary of changes, and changes marked;

an information access field for arranging background information, wherein the information access field includes at least one hypertext link that allows direct access to the background information; and

an interval field for arranging a control point frequency.

28. A program product stored on a recordable medium for arranging business process control point information in a template, comprising:

an interface for receiving business process control point information;

a separate template for each control point for arranging the received information, wherein the template comprises:

a test field for arranging a set of tests to be performed by a test entity, wherein the set of tests identifies an occurrence of a risk in a business process; and

an action field for arranging a set of actions, wherein the set of actions addresses the occurrence of the identified risk.

29. The program product of claim 28, wherein the template further comprises:

a business process field for arranging a business process;

a test execution field for arranging a test entity, wherein the test entity performs the set of tests;

an action execution field for arranging action entities, wherein the action entity performs the set of actions; and

an audit field for arranging audit details.

30. The program product of claim 29, wherein the template further comprises:

a name field for arranging a control point name;

a revision history field for arranging control point revisions, wherein the revision history field includes fields for arranging a revision number, a revision date, a summary of changes, and changes marked;

an information access field for arranging background information, wherein the information access field includes at least one hypertext link that allows direct access to the background information; and

an interval field for arranging a control point frequency.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence is entered and relied upon in the appeal.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

No decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding are identified in the related appeals and interferences section.